

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to nonfunctional descriptive material. Claim 1 has been amended so as to address this rejection. As a result, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Further, claims 1-17 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. None of these amendments have been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 5, 8, 10, 15 and 17 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.


Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,026.

Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer linking the present application to U.S. Patent No. 6,253,026. As a result, withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichi SAEKI et al.

By: 

David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicants

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 21, 2006